

E  
422  
G35  
1848  
BANC

*The Bancroft Library*

University of California • Berkeley

THE PETER AND ROSELL HARVEY  
MEMORIAL FUND

# AN APPEAL

TO

# THE FRIENDS OF PEACE.

There are always periods in the history of a country when every citizen, however far removed from the strife and tumult of party, is bound by the highest obligations of patriotism and duty, to assume an active part in the direction of public affairs. That period we have now reached, if the cry of popular discontent, which everywhere fills the land, be not strangely deceptive. Our Government, if past experience teaches anything, has for all practical purposes, become almost intolerable to those who bear its burdens. Under the form of free institutions, we have within a few years made rapid strides towards a despotism, and unless the downward tendency of things be speedily arrested, it is impossible to estimate the evils to which we may be subjected. The will of the people has been crushed again and again by a dangerous abuse of the Executive veto, and the plainest requirements of the Constitution prostituted to subserve the ends of reckless and misguided partisans. The nation has been plunged into a useless and extravagant war merely to gratify Presidential schemes of glory and empire, by the conquest and annexation of foreign territory. And, to crown all, this war which was to "conquer a peace" has ended, after an enormous sacrifice of blood and treasure, in territorial acquisitions, the chief use of which seems to be to alienate the people and weaken the bonds of the Union.

Such, briefly told, is our present condition; and such is likely to be the reward of patient forbearance in the future, if we longer hesitate to rid ourselves of those who have produced such unmitigated causes of complaint. The remedy is at hand, and no excuse, so far as we can judge, will palliate, much less justify its neglect. It is in revolution through the ballot-box—revolution which will preserve the Constitution from the assaults of its enemies, and restore to the Government that character for simplicity and purity with which it was originally impressed. To insure this, there must be perfect harmony and concert of action among those who desire a change of men and measures. Armed with the omnipotent ballot, all, whatever their minor differences on questions of expediency, must stand fast by their faith and guard the interest of the Republic. The right of suffrage is, perhaps, the proudest privilege of a freeman; and whoever fails to exercise it properly now, will be for so much responsible for whatever disasters may befall us hereafter. The Presidential election in November will decide the gravest issues which have ever been submitted to a free people. It will decide whether war is, of right, to be made as the caprice or passion of the President may suggest; whether conquest and carnage be the legitimate pursuit of an enlightened nation; and last, though not least, whether the One-man Power is to overshadow and control all the functions of legislation, and reduce the representatives of the People to the degrading level of Executive subordinates and menials. These have been the practical workings of that corrupt system, of which the present Administration claims the paternity, and in behalf of which it invokes the popular judgment. Of this system with all its calamities, we have in the candidate of the destructives, Gen. CASS, a faithful embodiment; while in Gen. TAYLOR we behold its antagonist. Between them a choice for the Presidency is soon to be made, for one or the other is morally certain to be the successor of Mr. Polk. The formation of third parties on a single idea, however much in consonance with the inclination of many well-meaning persons, can in no contingency prevent this result. Every vote

thrown against Gen. Taylor, whether given to Gen. Cass or not, will strengthen his chance of success. A third party may, perhaps, be made formidable enough to work incalculable mischief, by aiding in the elevation of the man its formation was designed specially to defeat. It certainly cannot do more. The only question for consideration, therefore, is, who of these two shall be chosen? And this leads us to inquire into their respective claims to the confidence and support of the Friends of Peace.

The only objection anywhere urged against Gen. TAYLOR is, his connection with the army; and the inference drawn from this, mistakenly, as we shall presently show, that he is unfit for civil station. It is true, that his military achievements have won for him a world-wide renown, but there are points in his character which have done more to endear him to his countrymen, than the fame of all his battles. His honesty and singleness of purpose, his rigid sense of justice, his unpretending modesty, and, above all, his humanity, present a character which shrinks from no test, and challenges general admiration. And it is to such a character, as rare as it is beautiful, that he is mainly indebted for his present position. As a soldier he is faithful to his duty; but much as he has been engaged in war, his fondest wishes have always been for the preservation of the peace of the country. He is, indeed, in all respects a man of peace; and there are few, whatever their prejudices, who have more openly rebuked the war spirit which has of late taken such deep hold of the public mind. At a dinner given him by the city authorities of Lafayette, in his own State, he declared, in response to a complimentary toast, that—

“The joy and exultation of the greatest victories were always, after the heat and excitement of the battle, succeeded by feelings of poignant sorrow and pain; and that war, after all, was a GREAT CALAMITY, and his the greatest glory who could terminate it.”

And alluding to the war, from which he had then recently returned, he further remarked:

“The object nearest to his heart had been to bring the war to a speedy termination—to restore peace and amity between two neighboring Republics, which had every motive to cultivate mutual good will, and which he would much prefer to see vying with each other in the arts of peace than contending on the field of battle.”—*Niles Register*, vol. 73, p. 337.

Again: In a letter to the Hon. Truman Smith, of the House of Representatives, dated Baton Rouge, March 4th, 1848, he said:

“I need hardly reply to your concluding inquiry, that I AM A PEACE MAN, and that I deem a state of peace to be absolutely necessary to the proper and healthful action of our republican institutions.”

The sentiment here so admirably expressed, is in perfect harmony with his letter of April 22, to Capt. J. S. Allison, of New Orleans, wherein he wrote:

“My life has been devoted to arms, yet I look upon war, at all times and under all circumstances, AS A NATIONAL CALAMITY, to be avoided if compatible with national honor.”

Such are Gen. TAYLOR's opinions on war; and they are such, it strikes us, as must satisfy every reasonable man. He is equally averse to territorial acquisition by conquest. In his letter to Gen. Gaines, dated Monterey, November 9th, 1846, he said:

“If we are (in the language of Mr. Polk and Gen. Scott) under the necessity of “conquering a peace,” and that by taking the capital of the country, we must go to Vera Cruz, take that place, and then march on to the city of Mexico. To do so in any other direction I consider out of the question. But, admitting that we conquer a peace by doing so—say at the end of the next twelve months—will the amount of blood and treasure which must be expended in doing so be compensated by the same? I think not—especially if the country we subdue is to be given up; and I imagine there are but few individuals in our country who think of ANNEXING MEXICO to the United States.”—*Niles Register*, vol. 70, p. 342.

It was this manly avowal of sentiments so opposite to the will and purpose of the Administration, that induced the reprimand which he received through the Secretary of War, Mr. Marcy. It was “this disclosure of his

views," that the Cabinet at Washington condemned, as likely to "disincline the enemy to enter into negotiations for peace," and which they revived an old "order," the very existence of which was almost unknown, to characterize as "michievous in design and disgraceful to the army!"\* His reply was worthy of the man, the cause, and the age. He reiterated every word he had written, and boldly told the Department that, although he regretted its determination to place him "in an attitude antagonistical to the Government," he should "*ask no favor and shrink from no responsibility.*" His letter to Mr. Truman Smith, from which we have already quoted, in reference to this subject, says:

"On this important question I freely confess myself to be the unqualified advocate of the principles so often laid down by the Father of his country, and so urgently recommended by him in his Farewell Address to the American people. Indeed, I think I may safely say *that no man can put a more implicit faith than I do in the wisdom of his advice when he urged upon us the propriety of always standing upon our 'own soil.'*"

And in the letter to Capt. Allison he tells us that—

"The principles of our Government, as well as its true policy, are opposed to the *subjugation of other nations, and the dismemberment of other countries by conquest.*"

If these declarations of Gen. Taylor be sincere, and he is more than rash who will question them, there is no room to doubt that his election to the Presidency will forever banish from our national councils that lust of conquest and dominion, which the evil spirits of the land have artfully aimed to inculcate among the people. But how stands the case with Gen. Cass?—Have the friends of peace any thing to expect of a man whose history, as a Senator, has been signalized by the sternest advocacy of the war policy of the Administration? On the Oregon question, he was the most ultra of those ultraists who planted themselves on the declaration of "54° 40' or fight." He was against all negotiation and all compromise, and for preparing the hearts of the people for war—war against England, and, if need be, the world! So far, indeed, did he push these views, that he held out to the last against the treaty by which the dispute was amicably adjusted. His course as to the Mexican war was not less remarkable. He defended it throughout, and the greater the outrage on public justice and popular rights, the higher it seemed to rise in his favor. He was for "vigorous prosecution" always, that we might conquer a peace and secure "indemnity for the past and security for the future," by seizing Mexican provinces and by dismembering the Mexican Republic. Elevate him to the Presidency, and it is not unlikely that the man who thought "*we MIGHT SWALLOW THE WHOLE OF MEXICO WITHOUT BEING HURT BY IT,*" will speedily open new paths to his ambition in the line of conquest, dismemberment, and annexation. If true to the party "platform" to which he has subscribed, he will be bound by honor and of necessity, to involve us in a war with England for Canada or Jamaica; or at all events to "swallow" Yucatan or Cuba, under the shallow pretence, that British dominion must be checked in its progress.

As a humane man, Gen. TAYLOR has few equals. His heart is filled with the tenderest sympathies, and prompts him always to comfort and console the suffering and sorrowful. Faithful to all the duties of his position, there is no duty which more cheerfully engages him than attention to the wounded, whether of his own men or those of the enemy. It was this spirit of humanity—a desire to spare helpless women and children, and stop the effusion of blood, that induced him in a great degree, to grant terms less rigorous than

\*Marcy's letter to Gen. Taylor, January 28, 1847, Executive doc., No. 60, 1st sess. 30th Cong., p. 391.

were first demanded at the capitulation of Monterey. In reference to that measure, in his letter to Gen. Gaines, of November 9th, 1846, he said :

"Had we been put to the alternative of taking the place by storm, (which there is no doubt we should have succeeded in doing,) we should in all probability have lost fifty or a hundred men in killed, besides the wounded, *which I wished to avoid*, as there appeared to be a prospect of peace, even if a distant one. *I also wished to avoid the destruction of women and children*, which must have been very great had the storming process been resorted to."

He held the same language in a letter to the Secretary of War. And yet, it was for this exhibition of feeling honorable alike to his country and himself, that Gen. Cass voted to censure him! Yes, to censure him; for what else than censure could be intended by a qualified vote of thanks; what else could it convey, than a disposition to wound, and humble, and mortify? Let us note the facts. On the 30th of January, 1847, a resolution of thanks to Gen. Taylor, "and, through him, to the brave officers and soldiers under his command, for their courage, skill, fortitude, and good conduct, in storming the city of Monterey," was taken up in the House of Representatives. It was amended, on the motion of a friend of the Administration, as follows:

"Provided, That nothing herein contained, shall be construed into an approbation of the terms of the capitulation of Monterey."

In this form it went to the Senate, where Mr. Speight, a Democratic Senator, who said, "he was not the man to thank with one hand and censure with the other," pronounced it "*a direct vote of censure*" on Gen. Taylor,\* and moved, on the 3d of February, to strike it out of the resolution. The motion was carried by a majority of more than two to one, but LEWIS CASS voted in the negative. The following is the negative vote:

Messrs. Allen, Ashley, Atchison, Atherton, Bagby, Breese, Bright, CASS, Dix, Hannegan, Niles, Sevier, Sturgeon, Turney, and Yulee—15."—*Senate Journal*, 2d sess. 29th Cong., p. 163.

Thus it seems, considerations of humanity, "a wish to avoid the destruction of women and children, and spare the sacrifice of life," which outweighed, in the mind of the honest old soldier, all the temporary advantages to be gained by sacking a city, had no influence with Gen. Cass and his fourteen associates.

Gen. Taylor is also strictly moral and temperate in his habits. He is not profane, nor does he swear or gamble; in fact, in all the relations of life, wherever placed, and under every circumstance, he is the model of a man. He is neither bigoted nor intolerant in his opinions, and pays the highest respect to the rights of conscience. His is the religion of charity, benevolence, and tolerance, a religion broad enough to embrace all his fellow-men without regard to their creed or form of worship. To show that we indulge in no idle picture to suit the occasion, we subjoin the following testimonial:

*General Taylor's character, as drawn by the Reverend Mr. Lamb, one of his chaplains.*

"At the conference of the Congregational and Presbyterian ministers of Hillsboro' county, N. H., assembled on the 14th of June, the Rev. Mr. Lamb, who was formerly a chaplain in the army under General Taylor, at Fort Jesup, said that the opening for him to do good in the army was through General Taylor, and through the General's influence a temperance society was formed, by means of which 600 drunkards were reformed; that the General told him that it was all a sham for a man to pretend he could not stand the damps and heats of the South without spirituous liquors. General Taylor was a total abstinence man, and the only commanding officer who did not drill his troops on the Sabbath. Mr. Lamb also stated that General Taylor attended his church regularly, and used no profane language."

This is from a minister of the Protestant persuasion; let us hear now from a Catholic chaplain, who was near him through his most trying scenes in Mexico. Father McElroy, who is confessedly among the most enlightened and devoted philanthropists of the day, in a recent conversation with Thurlow Weed, Esq., of the "*Albany Evening Journal*," says Gen. Taylor is

\*Niles' Register, vol. 71., p. 357.

truly "*a great and good man.*" "*Courage, guided by prudence, and justice, tempered with humanity, are his prominent characteristics. Temperance and simplicity of habit and manner, mark his intercourse with society. Integrity and patriotism stand out boldly in all his official acts. In a word, Father McElroy expresses his conviction that in the elements that form his character, and the motives and objects which prompt and guide him, he bears a strong and marked resemblance to Washington.*"

His honesty and rectitude are as lofty; too, as his sense of justice is scrupulous and exact. He scorns everything that is not fair and upright, and no man, says the distinguished Gen. Persifer F. Smith, (who is politically opposed to him,) "however corrupt or base himself, could, after five minutes conversation with him, dare to propose, or even hint at anything dishonest or mean." As President, he will lose nothing of these invaluable prerequisites to a proper administration of the Government. He will be what he has always been from his earliest boyhood, plain, direct, and honest. His views are in all things eminently conservative and practical, and he will bear himself in his high office, not as a partisan seeking to build up and perpetuate power by rewarding parasites and flatterers, and by securing the triumph of selfish schemes and sectional measures, but as an American patriot, determined to be the President of the People, to consult their wishes and bow to their will. His principles are the principles of Washington, and his Administration will be fashioned after that of the earlier Presidents of the Republic. He has no sectional prejudices, and nothing could induce him to attempt to foster or strengthen one portion of the country to the injury or sacrifice of another. He will know no North and no South, but stand by the glorious Union of a free people, cemented by ties of a common kindred, a common interest, and common duty. The rights of the whole people will be strictly regarded, and the interests of the whole Union, however conflicting, harmonized and protected.

The objection to General TAYLOR, that he has no fitness for civil station, is entirely without force. He has all the intellect and all the learning necessary to grace the highest. His whole military life gives evidence of this. No man, if he had not mind, and a mind too of the first order, could have produced such splendid results. He has that within him, strong common sense united with sound judgment, which alone is valuable in practical life. He has proved, wherever put, equal to any emergency, and never in the course of his long and eventful career has he made a mistake or committed a blunder. All his public duties have been rigidly fulfilled, and whatever has been required of him has been done not only to the satisfaction of the country, but done as no one else could do it. Examine the history of his undertakings and achievements as you will—view them as a combination or in detail, and they evince far-reaching sagacity and the greatest ability. Whoever comes in contact with him is at a moment impressed with this conviction. Gen. Persifer F. Smith, who knows him well, writing to a friend under date of Mexico, April 8, 1848, pays the following compliment to his character:

"General Taylor's military exploits (said he) are not the causes of his popularity; they are only the occasion for the display of his sound judgment, energy of character, lofty and pure sense of justice, and incorruptible honesty. He has as much reputation for what he has written as for what he has done, because even where the composition is not his own, the sentiments, motives, and feelings are; and everything he says, as everything he does, is marked by the purity and loftiness of his own character. \* \* \* I remember your asking me, at the time he was put in command at Corpus Christi, whether he was equal to the circumstances. I told you of his sound judgment, and inexhaustible energy, as I had learned them in Florida, but I did not then estimate properly the other and higher points of his character. In the campaign on the Rio Grande, I saw him tried under all circumstances, and he always came out pure gold."



But, it is said, "he acknowledges his own unfitness for the Presidency, and this of itself should present an impassable barrier to his election. He knows the responsibilities of the Executive office, and feels how much is expected and should be accomplished in its wise and just administration. He therefore distrusts his powers, fearing that an honest zeal for the public welfare may fall short of the public expectation. And in this he has a notable example—WASHINGTON himself. That great man, in reply to Mr. Thompson, who bore him the intelligence of his first election, said :

"While I realize the arduous nature of the task which is imposed upon me, and FEEL MY OWN INABILITY to perform it, I wish that there may be no reason for regretting the choice ; for indeed all I can promise is only to accomplish that which can be done by an honest zeal."—10th volume Sparks, p. 460.

A month later, writing to General Schuyler, he repeated the sentiment :

"It is only from the assurances of support which I have received from the respectable and worthy characters in every part of the Union, that I am able to overcome the diffidence which I have IN MY OWN ABILITIES to execute my great and important trust to the best interest of our country. An honest zeal and an unremitting attention to the interests of the United States, are all I dare promise."—10th vol. Sparks, p. 2.—where will also be found a similar letter to General Wayne.

This is precisely what General TAYLOR says, and were he to say less he would lose much of the general esteem he enjoys ; for no man who would approach such a high calling in any other than a spirit of humility and diffidence should be honored with it, because *he* would be least likely to adorn it.

Far be it from us, to reflect on the honor or honesty of General Cass, between whom and General Taylor, as we have elsewhere remarked, the decision is to be made. But we are frank to confess, that we distrust him. He is too much of a partisan, is too ultra in his views, has too many friends to reward and too many enemies to punish, and is too far pledged to particular and sectional interests, to bid us hope for anything wise or good from his election. He has not the firmness nor the fortitude for the times. He is surrounded by courtiers, and must be governed by cliques and cabals. As a private citizen he may, perhaps, have no superiors ; but as a celebrated English writer, who had a clear conception of the human mind and its besetting passions, has well said, "men are generally more honest in their private than in their public capacity." Honor is a great check upon mankind ; but where a man becomes a partisan, this check is in a great measure removed, since a man is sure to be approved of by his own party, for what promotes their interest ; and he soon learns to despise the clamors of adversaries. Such is General Cass. He could not, nay, he dare not if he would, so strong are the influences that control him, look to the clamors of his adversaries—he dare not consult the public good. Party, party, and its interest would rule all his actions and guide the destiny, evil though it be, of the Republic.

There is, however, what should be with every friend of peace an insuperable objection to sustaining him, either directly or otherwise. He has shown himself again and again hostile to their petitions, and by his votes, at least, invaded the rights of conscience. The Society of Friends, as a peaceful, peace-loving people, were opposed to the Mexican war, and obeying the dictates of duty they petitioned Congress "to devise and adopt such measures as would put a speedy end to its existence, with the multiplied evils and direful calamities attendant upon it." And how was this prayer, so respectful in itself, and so free from all political prejudice, received ? The memorials were laid on the table and their printing refused, Gen. Cass being of those who gave them this summary disposition. We find the following in the Senate's Journal of proceedings of Wednesday, December 23d, 1846 :

"Mr. Atherton, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred a memorial of the representatives of the Society of Friends of New England, reported that the same be not printed. The Senate proceeded to consider the report.



On motion by Mr. Davis to amend the report, by striking out the word "*not*," it was determined in the negative, yeas, 21, nays, 21.

On motion by Mr. Davis, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present, those who voted in the negative are—

Messrs. Allen, Ashley, Atchison, Atherton, Bagby, Benton, Breese, Bright, Butler, CASS, Chalmers, Dickinson, Dix, Houston, Lewis, Semple, Sevier, Sturgeon, Turney, Westcott, Yulee.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President determined the question in the negative." *Senate Journal, 2d sess., 29th Cong. p. 66-67.*

And on Wednesday, the 3d of February, 1847, the following proceedings were had in the same body :

"The Senate proceeded to consider the report of the Committee on Printing on the motion to print the memorial of the Baltimore yearly meeting of Friends, the memorial of the yearly meeting of Friends held in Philadelphia, and the memorial of the religious Society of Friends of Indiana yearly meeting, to wit: "That the memorials be *not* printed:" and, on the question to *concur* in the report, it was determined in the affirmative, yeas, 23; nays, 21.

On motion by Mr. Atherton, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present, those who voted in the affirmative are—

Messrs. Allen, Ashley, Atchison, Atherton, Bagby, Benton, Breese, Bright, Butler, Calhoun, CASS, Chalmers, Dix, Hannegan, Houston, Niles, Rusk, Soule, Speight, Sturgeon, Turney, Westcott, Yulee.

So the motion to print the memorials was not agreed to.—*Senate Journal, 2d sess., 29th Congress, p. 162.*

We cannot always fathom men's motives, perhaps, nor is it right to impugn them; but if a man wishes to escape suspicion, if he would stand fair in the judgment of the world, he must shape his conduct aright, and keep aloof from those whom there is reason to adjudge guilty. We cannot avoid the conclusion, however, that Gen. Cass, in voting against printing these memorials at the last session of Congress, was operated on by the same motives which induced one of his party friends of the House of Representatives, to speak and vote against printing a similar memorial at this session. On the 10th of February, 1848, Mr. King, of Massachusetts, presented the memorial of the representatives of the yearly meeting of the Society of Friends of New England. It was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, when the question recurred on the motion to print it. The memorial being read, Mr. Henley, of Indiana, addressed the House in opposition to the motion. His speech was as follows:

"Mr. Speaker: (said he) This is not the first time since this war began, that memorials of this character have been presented to this House, containing the same views. And what do these memorialists ask for? They pray Congress to feel the responsibility of the situation it occupies before the country, and to take measures to bring about a peace. When they come and ask us to feel our responsibility before the country and bring about a peace, they charge us with not feeling our responsibility, and with having no desire for peace. And in charging it *they charge a falsehood* on this Congress; or on that particular party against which they mean to make it. It is for this reason that I desire to make a few remarks. I admit they are respectable people—I admit they are good citizens. I am proud to acknowledge that there are many of them in my own State and in my own district. There are some of that class of people amongst my own relatives. Many of my connexions are of that denomination of people. I know them, and they know they have been opposed to this country in every contest. In the holy war of the Revolution they were against their country because of their peculiar notions on the subject of war. They *may* have been *honest*; but the fault of this people is that they permit their peculiar notions to overcome their patriotism and love of country. That is the fault they have committed. They may charge the fault on others, but I say we may charge it on them. They know that they were opposed to this country in the last war with Great Britain. That every one will acknowledge. This people then prayed for peace, and on what conditions? Not because peace would secure the honor and glory of the national character, but they desired a peace at all hazards. And that is what these memorialists now ask." \* \* \* \* "Though they are very honest and conscientious people, perhaps it may be that on the subject of war they are not so conscientious as they might be. I know well that they profess to be opposed to military chieftains as the occupants of the high offices of this Republic, but they have voted for military chieftains for high office; and may they not do it again? When they deemed it necessary, they could vote for a military chieftain of the Federal party, and may they not at some period be brought to support a war? Sir, I am opposed to the motion to print."—*National Intelligencer, February 11, 1848.*

Whether it be calumnious or not to denounce a people as against their country in the Revolutionary war and the war of 1812, who gave Nathaniel Greene to one and Jacob Brown to another, we shall leave the nation, and not Mr.

Henley, to decide. The same tribunal can also decide, whether those who sustained Washington's drooping army at Valley Forge, and succored and relieved the sick and wounded at Princeton and Trenton, at Brandywine, and Germantown; and Guilford Court House, "permit their peculiar notions to overcome their patriotism and love of country." The more important question here, as there can be no mistake as to this, is, why the petitions from a body of people as industrious, as thriving, and as respectable as any in our country—petitions couched in the most decorous and inoffensive terms, were refused to be printed, especially when the cost of printing would, in no instance, have exceeded five dollars? Why did Gen. Cass so wound the feelings of such a people? Was it, that like his friend and supporter, Mr. Henley, he thought that "on the subject of war they are not so conscientious as they might be," or that he also, had an account to settle with them for having voted for such "military chieftains" as Washington and Harrison? At this particular time this becomes a very pertinent inquiry, and we greatly fear, if fairly brought to trial, Gen. Cass could, no more than Mr. Henley stand its test. Be that as it may, it is a somewhat singular coincidence, that while he and his *Democratic* friends formed a unit in the Senate, Mr. Henley, at another session of Congress, came within an ace of rallying them, with like unanimity, to the charge in which he played the leader.

## APPENDIX.

"During the war against the Seminole Indians in Florida, Gen. Jesup entered into an arrangement with the friendly Creeks who were in the service of the United States, by which it was stipulated that they should retain for their services, all the negroes they might capture. There was a considerable number captured, and the Creeks, as it appears from the public document, to which we shall presently refer "refused the \$8,000 offered them under the direction of Gen. Jesup, for their interest in these negroes." Mr. Nathaniel F. Collins, of Alabama, was then appointed their attorney, in fact to receive them. And an order was issued to the commanding officer in Florida to deliver them to him. The order went to Gen. Taylor, as he had succeeded Gen. Jesup in the chief command, subsequent to the time of its issue. He very positively refused, nevertheless, to comply with its requirements, and the negroes never were delivered. The following is the correspondence between the Adjutant General and General Taylor:

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE, WASHINGTON, May, 1838.

SIR: Herewith you will receive a copy of a communication made to the Secretary of War by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The request contained therein having been approved by the Secretary, you will please to give the necessary attention to the matter, so far as you are concerned, and comply with the requisition of Mr. Collins.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant, R. JONES, *Adjutant General.*  
Major General JESUP, Commanding Army in Florida, Tampa, Florida.  
Brevet Major ZANTZINGER, *Fort Pike, Louisiana,*

HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE SOUTH, Tampa, Florida, June 2, 1838.

GENERAL: I have the honor to acknowledge your communication of the 10th of May, 1838, accompanied by one of the 9th, from the commissioner of Indian affairs, addressed to Capt. Cooper, acting Secretary of War, on the subject of turning over certain negroes captured by the Creek warriors in Florida, to a Mr. Collins, their agent, in compliance with an engagement of Gen. Jesup.

I know nothing of the negroes in question, nor of the subject, farther than what is contained in the communication above referred to; but, I must state distinctly, for the information of all concerned, that while I shall hold myself ever ready to do the utmost in my power to get the Indians and their negroes out of Florida, as well as to remove them to their homes west of the Mississippi, I cannot for a moment consent to meddle in this transaction, or to be concerned, for the benefit of Mr. Collins, the Creek Indians, or any one else; or to INTERFERE IN ANY WAY BETWEEN THE INDIANS AND THEIR NEGROES, WHICH MAY HAVE A TENDENCY TO DEPRIVE THE FORMER OF THEIR PROPERTY, AND REDUCE THE LATTER FROM A COMPARATIVE STATE OF FREEDOM TO THAT OF SLAVERY; at the same time I shall take every means to obtain and restore to his lawful owner any slave among the Indians who has absconded or been captured by them.

Very respectfully, I have the honor to be, General, your obedient servant, Z. TAYLOR.  
Brevet Brig. U. S. Army, Commanding.

Gen. R. JONES, Adjutant Gen. U. S. Army, Washington, D. C.

(Executive Document 225, 3d session, 25th Congress, pages 29 and 30.)



